

1 27. (New) The digital data signal of claim 24 wherein the cardinality is
2 unlimited.

1 28. (New) The digital data signal of claim 24 wherein at least one of the first
2 set of playback devices is a hardware playback device.

1 29. (New) The digital data signal of claim 24 wherein at least one of the first
2 set of playback devices is a software player.

1 30. (New) The digital data signal of claim 24 wherein the first digital audio
2 content further comprises digital video programming.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10-13, 17, 18 and 20-23 have been amended. Claims 9 and 19 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 24-30 have been added. Thus, claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,757,907 issued to Cooper, et al. (*Cooper*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 21 are not anticipated by *Cooper*. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include limitations from claims 10 and 20, respectively. Claim 21 has been amended to include similar

limitations. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 11 and 21 are allowable for at least the reasons that claims 10 and 20 are allowable.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Claim 12 depends from claim 11. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 7, 8 and 12 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4, 6, 14, 16-18 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,879 issued to Wyman (*Wyman*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4, 6, 14, 16-18 and 22 are not rendered obvious by *Cooper* and *Wyman*.

Claims 2, 4, and 6 depend from claim 1. Claims 14 and 16-18 depend from claim 11. Claim 22 depends from claim 20. *Wyman* is cited to teach storage of licenses in multiple content. See October 14, 1999 Office Action at page 3, comment 13. However, whether or not *Wyman* teaches or suggests storage of licenses as described, *Wyman* does not cure the deficiencies of *Cooper*. Therefore, no combination of *Cooper* and *Wyman* teaches or suggests claims 2, 4, 6, 14, 16-18 and 22.

Claims 9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Cooper* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,504 issued to Griswold (*Griswold*). Claims 9 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection of claims 9 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 5, 10, 13, 15, 20 and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-8, 10-18 and 20-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: JAN. 14, 2000



Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200